



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,297	02/27/2004	Hao Xue	51085-6 /slb	6561
7380	7590	04/08/2008	EXAMINER	
SMART & BIGGAR			NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG	
P.O. BOX 2999, STATION D				
900-55 METCALFE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OTTAWA, ON K1P5Y6			2618	
CANADA				
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		04/08/2008		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/787,297	XUE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	TUAN H. NGUYEN	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 5-8, 14-17 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 9-13, 18-22 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's remark on page 13, Applicant argues that Otha C. Lee et al. (U.S PAT. 3,564,148 hereinafter, "Otha") reference cited by the Examiner for claims 1-4, 9-12, 18, 20-21 and 26-27 do not teach "selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier". Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant argument. The Applicant should refer to the abstract and (col. 2 lines 30-39) of Otha where as the Examiner interpreted "selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier" i.e., **the subscriber station** is allowed to originate calls in the do-not-disturb condition but incoming calls are not allowed to ring the station in this condition. The operator has the option to **override the do-not-disturb condition** in an emergency without changing the state of said circuit (abstract) and a number display is indicated at 3 which can provide a room number or **extension number from an identifier circuit (not shown)**. This displayed extension number, or a plurality of such extension numbers, can be provided by joint action of the marker and the identifier. These displayed extension numbers serve as a reminder of the number calling when a guest wishes to leave a message not to be disturbed or a message to be

called at a particular time (col. 2 lines 30-39). Therefore, the Otha patent is still read on limitations recited above.

Base on the above rational, it is believed that the claimed limitations are met by the references submitted and therefore, the rejections are maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 18, 20-21 and 26-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson, Motorola, Siemens, Nokia Technical Specification (Push to Talk over Cellular (PoC); User Requirements; PoC Release 1.0; User Requirements V 1.1.1 (2003-10) hereinafter, “Ericsson”) in view of Otha C. Lee et al. (U.S PAT. 3,564,148 hereinafter, “Otha”).

Consider claims 1 and 10, Ericsson teaches a talk request processing in a do-not-disturb (DnD) capable communication system, comprising: receiving a talk request for a requested walkie-talkie-like (PoC) communications session involving a user device capable of walkie-talkie-like functionality (page 13 paragraph 5.10 Access List

management e.g., on the reject list the user maintains users and/or groups from whom the user does not accept to receive instant talk session requests); and selectively overriding DnD functionality for the requested walkie-talkie-like communications session (page 13 paragraph 5.8 Do-Not-Disturb e.g., a user shall be able to easily activate and deactivate the DnD function) based on an ignoreDnD attribute for the user device applied to a criterion of the talk request (page 17 paragraph 6.2.1.1 Inviting User e.g., the system shall check the inviting user registered, incoming session are not blocked (read on ignoreDnD) for any reason when DnD is active).

Ericsson does not explicitly show that selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier.

In the same field of endeavor, Otha teaches selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier, as taught by Otha, in order to employ an automatic switching system to enable manual control of visual indicators at individual telephone extensions of a private branch telephone exchange.

Consider claim 20, Ericsson teaches a user device capable of walkie-talkie-like functionality for a do-not-disturb (DnD) capable communication system, the user device comprising: a user interface adapted to accept an external input (inviting user) to modify

an ignoreDnD attribute for the user device, the ignoreDnD attribute concerning a criterion of a talk request; an ignoreDnD attribute request generator responsive to said external input adapted to send a network call processing server a request to update the ignoreDnD attribute of the user device (page 17 paragraph 6.2.1.1 Inviting User e.g., the system shall check the inviting user registered (read on update the ignoreDnD), incoming session are not blocked (read on ignoreDnD) for any reason when DnD is active).

Ericsson does not explicitly show that selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier.

In the same field of endeavor, Otha teaches selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, selectively overriding DnD functionality based on a condition or criterion of the call other than a user device identifier, as taught by Otha, in order to employ an automatic switching system to enable manual control of visual indicators at individual telephone extensions of a private branch telephone exchange.

Consider claims 2, 11, and 21, Ericsson further teaches the user device is a wireless device (page 11 paragraph 5.3).

Consider claim 3, Ericsson further teaches the ignoreDnD attribute comprises an ignoreDnD flag, and wherein selectively overriding said DnD functionality is a function of the ignoreDnD flag (page 13 paragraph 5.10 Access List Management).

Consider claim 4, Ericsson further teaches the ignoreDnD attribute comprises at least one predetermined ignore reason value, and wherein selectively overriding said DnD functionality is a function of the at least one predetermined ignore reason value (page 6 [0078]).

Consider claims 9 and 18, Ericsson further teaches maintaining the ignoreDnD attribute for a plurality of user devices as a function of inputs received from the user devices (page 17 paragraph 6.2.1.1).

Consider claim 12, Ericsson further teaches the network call function comprises: a data store adapted to store the ignoreDnD attribute for the user device (page 11 paragraph 5.2); a DnD processing function adapted to provide DnD functionality (page 11 paragraph 5.2); and an ignoreDnD processing function adapted to override DnD functionality for the requested communications session as a function of the ignoreDnD attribute stored in the data store for the user device (page 17 paragraph 6.2.1.1).

Consider claims 26 and 27, Otha further teaches the network call processing function is further adapted to: for said user device associate therewith an access list

specifying which other user devices are permitted to reach said user device (col. 2 lines 18-27); on overriding said DnD functionality, process the access list to assess whether the talk request should be forwarded to the user device or not (abstract).

4. Claims 13, 19, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson, Motorola, Siemens, Nokia Technical Specification (Push to Talk over Cellular (PoC); User Requirements; PoC Release 1.0; User Requirements V 1.1.1 (2003-10) hereinafter, “Ericsson”) in view of Otha and further in view of Griffiths (U.S PUB. 2002/0186827).

Consider claim 13, Ericsson and Otha, in combination, fails to teach the ignoreDnD attribute comprises an ignoreDnD flag and at least one predetermined ignore reason value, and wherein the ignoreDnD processing function selectively overrides said DnD functionality as a function of the ignoreDnD flag and the at least one predetermined ignore reason value.

However, Griffiths teaches the ignoreDnD attribute comprises an ignoreDnD flag and at least one predetermined ignore reason value, and wherein the ignoreDnD processing function selectively overrides said DnD functionality as a function of the ignoreDnD flag and the at least one predetermined ignore reason value (page 6 [0078]).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Griffiths into view of Ericsson and Otha, in

order to implement a call administration service, permitting both interactive and automatic denial and routing of calls, under the direction of subscriber provisioning.

Consider claim 19, Griffiths further teaches a talk request processing system in the form of a call processing server (page 9 [0109]).

Consider claim 22, Griffiths further teaches a user interface display for displaying modifications for the ignoreDnD attribute indicated by the external input (page 6 [0075]).

Consider claim 25, Griffiths further teaches a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions stored thereon for execution on a processor (page 9 [0109]).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The applicant's remarks, filed on 12/21/2007, have been carefully reviewed with updated search. Consequently, reasons for allowance of claims 5-8, 14-17, and 23 are set forth in according to the applicant's remarks state on pages 5-6.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_ (Explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-8329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am - 5:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Maung Nay A. can be reached on (571)272-7882882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information Consider the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan Nguyen/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2618

/Nay A. Maung/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2618